

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/779,495	KAWANISHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Marjorie A. Moran	1631	

**All Participants:**

(1) Marjorie A. Moran.

(2) M. Sheikerz.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 7 October 2003

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*All*

Claims discussed:

*2 and 8-9*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Mr. Sheikerz that the after-final amendment and arguments had been fully considered. The amendment to claim 2 will overcome one of the rejections made under 35 USC 112. However, as it is still unclear what limitation of the means itself is intended by the recitation of an operator "interactively designating", claim 2 is still indefinite, and the rejections with regard to this phrase are maintained. The examiner and attorney discussed claim language which would overcome this rejection. The examiner also stated that it appears that applicant does not understand the examiner's interpretation of claim 8. The examiner stated that this appeared to be due to differences in interpreting claim terminology, and attempted to explain this to the attorney. The examiner stated that she would also try to clarify this matter in the Advisory Action. As rejections under 35 USC 112 and 103 are maintained, the claims are not allowable. The examiner stated that she would mail this Interview Summary and an Advisory Action.